

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments set out above and the following remarks are responsive to the points raised by the Office Action dated July 12, 2010. In view of the amendments set out above and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Pending Claims

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claims 22 and 49, which are cancelled, and claim 29 is amended to include the limitations of claims 30 and 31, which are also cancelled. Claims 24, 25, 36, 42, and 43 are rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7, 14, 47, and 48 were previously cancelled. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-21, 23-29, and 32-46 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants are pleased to note that the Office Action indicates that claims 24, 25, 31, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 45, and 49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claims are so rewritten as explained in more detail below.

The Office Action

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-23, 26-29, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 44, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,030,520 to Dziwinski et al. (hereinafter, "Dziwinski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,093,099 to Haishi et al. (hereinafter, "Haishi").

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,869 to Heskett (hereinafter, "Heskett") in view of Dziwinski.

Claim 35 was rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over Dziwinski in view of Haishi as applied to claim 33 and further in view of Heskett.

Each of these rejections is separately and respectfully traversed. However, in order to expedite matters and allow the application to pass to issuance quickly, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 49 and intervening claim 22, which was indicated to be allowable. In addition, claims 24 and 25 are each rewritten in independent form including the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claims 22 and 23, which were also indicated to be allowable. Claim 29 is also amended to include the limitations of claim 31 and intervening claim 30, which was also indicated to be allowable. Claim 36 is also rewritten in independent form including the limitations of base claim 29 and intervening claims 33 and 35, which was indicated to be allowable. Claims 42 and 43 are also each rewritten in independent form including the limitations of base claim 29 and intervening claims 40 and 41, which were also indicated to be allowable. The dependencies of claims 23, 27, and 39 are amended accordingly.

Conclusion

It is believed that this amendment obviates all outstanding rejections and places this patent application in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie M. Lawley
Stephanie M. Lawley, Reg. No. 55362
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: Oct. 12, 2010

Amendment or ROA - Regular (SML/mlg)